

Blewett 2001-0057

REMARKS

It is noted that claims 1-58 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. A response to this rejection shall be provided when the rejection is no longer provisional.

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 12-26, 28,31-33, 36-43, 45, 48-50, and 55-58 were rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Flint et al, US Patent 6,453,419.

Independent claims 1, 25 and 42 are amended herein. As amended, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims as well as all of the dependent claims are not anticipated by Flint et al.

The Examiner points to FIG. 2 of Flint et al in support of the rejection. This figure consists of a gateway at a center, with four networks connected to the gateway through direct "spoke" connections, including a protected network, and an untrusted network. In contradistinction, the amended claims are directed to apparatus that includes a protected network that is connected to a gateway via the untrusted network. The claimed method pertains to operation within such an arrangement, and the claimed machine readable medium is adapted to operate within such an arrangement.

More specifically, amended claim 1 specifies "a logical interface to a fourth network, via said third network, that is a protected resource network" (emphasis supplied), amended claim 25 is a machine readable medium for performing a method in an environment that includes a "logical interface to a fourth network that is a protected resource network where said logical interface to said fourth network is via said third network," (emphasis supplied), and amended claim 42 defines a method in the aforementioned environment. Thus independent claims 1, 25 and 42 are not anticipated by Flint et al, and neither are the claims that depend on these independent claims.

It may be noted that at least some of the dependent claims also contain limitations that are not found in the reference.

Claim 14, for example, specifies the security gateway of claim 1, wherein the interface to the protected resource network includes a VPN tunnel utilizing the untrusted network. Clearly, that is not happening in the Flint et al network, since the protected network does not communicate with the gateway via an untrusted network. The

Blewett 2001-0057

Examiner points to reference number 45 of FIG. 2, but there is no teaching that connection 45 is a VPN tunnel, and it is quite clear that connection 45 is NOT a connection between the protected resource network and the gateway that "includes a VPN tunnel utilizing the untrusted network." The same argument applies to claims 22, 38 and 55.


Claims 3, 5-6, 10-11, 27, 29-30, 34-35, 44, 46-47 and 51-54 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Flint et al US patent 6,453,875 in view of Chopra et al, US Patent 6,611,875. The Chopra et al reference is cited for the proposition that its teachings can be combined with those of the Flint et al reference to suggest the limitations introduced in the dependent claims, such as the claim 3 limitation of a translation of "the source network address of a packet sent to the second network to be the network address of the security gateway interface to the second network." However, the Chopra reference translates an address to an IP address, which is an address of the untrusted network. In claim 3, however, the translation is not to an address of the untrusted network. Therefore, claim 3 is clearly not obvious in view of the Flint et al and Chopra et al combination of references. Moreover, even in the absence of this difference claim 3 would not be obvious in view of the Flint et al and Chopra et al combination of references because the limitation of amended claim 1 that is missing in Flint et al is still missing, and is not suggested by, the combination of the cited references. This reasoning applies to all of the dependent claims and, therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claims 3, 5-6, 10-11, 27, 29-30, 34-35, 44, 46-47 and 51-54 are patentable in view of the Flint et al and Chopra et al combination of references.

Blewett 2001-0057

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that all of the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance of the outstanding claims are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully,
Charles Douglas Blewett
John S. Denker
Robert J. Hall

Dated: 7/12/05

By 
Henry T. Brendzel
Reg. No. 26,844
Phone (973) 467-2025
Fax (973) 467-6589
email brendzel@comcast.net